

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,872	10/19/2001	Simon Blanchard	PHTW 000007	4956
24737 75	590 12/24/2003		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			MCLEAN MAYO, KIMBERLY N	
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF 1	MANOR, NY 10510	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2187	
			DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003	. //

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

09/306.

	À		<
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	O
Advisory Action	10/082,872	BLANCHARD, SIMON	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly N. McLean-Mayo	2187	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in	
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		·
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailir S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MP	PEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	of extension and the corresponding ame the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate of originally set in the final Office as	extension ction; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifyin	g the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amend	ment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Art			the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	!
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		•	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTØ-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	Apollorles MX	es Mayo	
(//KIMBERLY MCLEAN-MÁYO PRIMARY EXAMINER	Kimberly N. McLean-Mayo Examiner	
		Art Unit: 2187	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/082,872

Art Unit: 2187

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The device taught by Becker which corresponds to the device (100) cited in claim 4 is Figure 3 and not simply Reference 100 as stated by the Applicant. Applicant's claim calls for a device, which comprises various elements, wherein such elements are taught by Becker's device shown in Figure 3. Hence Becker teaches the claimed invention.